

News

Mineral Physics Machines

The field of mineral physics will benefit from an era of big physics machines that will produce intense beams of X rays, neutrons, and high-energy particles. The new super accelerators are being built as tools for high-energy physics experiments and for materials science research.

Mineral physics studies are among the most sophisticated to be conducted. High-intensity X rays will be used to solve complex crystal structures, to detail the steps of fast mineral phase changes, and to penetrate to the sample chambers of high-pressure cells. Neutron beams powerful enough to penetrate surface layers of the earth's crust will be used to probe for mineral deposits.

Notable among the machines of this forthcoming era are the new synchrotrons and the "Desertron," a device so large it requires large, wide-open spaces. The new machines have recently received strong votes of support by the Department of Energy panels and by Congressional Committees, but only after stirring considerable controversy [see *Eos*, January 3, 1984, p. 1, for a report on the controversy surrounding academic science lobbying].

Evidently a lot is at stake for the United States in the world of high-energy particle studies. The superconducting Super Collider (SSC), or Desertron, has evolved at the expense of the Isabella superconducting proton-proton collider (officially, Colliding Beam Accelerator), which has been under construction at the Brookhaven National Laboratory since 1978 at a cost of over \$200 million. Isabella, which had been plagued with design problems, is now considered obsolete even though it has not been completed. Isabella would have had a ring diameter of 3.5 km (actually already constructed). The SSC may have a ring diameter on the order of 100 km.

An example of a newly proposed and politically controversial accelerator that will have mineral physics applications is the new synchrotron light source at the National Center for Advanced Materials (NCAM) at the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory in California. The synchrotron as originally planned was to be built as a central part of a large, materials science research and development laboratory. Controversy has resulted from the suddenness with which the project and its funding were announced in early 1983. The entire cost was announced as \$84 million, to be spread over 5 years. No peer review or competitive structure was employed by the Office of Management and Budget, and broad criticism has been voiced. The result has been that the synchrotron has been shelved for separate consideration and review by a special panel put together by the Department of Energy from which the funds are to be derived.

The concept of having research laboratories located next to (actually attached to) a synchrotron light source has a lot to be said for it. The synchrotron X ray beams in such demand for diffraction, fluorescence, line structure, and other physical measurements of minerals and other materials are only available to an investigator for short periods requiring advance notice. One to three days of beam-time per year is about the maximum currently available. For protection from the intense radiation, all experiments and measurements must be done by remote control, and thus an investigator must be prepared to spend time simply setting up for alignment and other premeasurements. Location of materials laboratories in close proximity to a synchrotron is unusually advantageous.—PMB

global deforestation by G. M. Woodwell and others stated that, "appropriate action taken now might reduce or eliminate the problem. Stabilization of the rate of combustion of fossil fuels combined with a program of reforestation would contribute toward stabilizing the CO₂ content of the atmosphere... we need not accept as inexorable a global warming due to the accumulation of CO₂ in the atmosphere" (*Science*, 222, 1081-1086, 1983).

The conclusions may be correct, but the factors affecting the release of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere are complex. The level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere varies, following major seasonal pulses. In the northern hemisphere, spring and summer levels are lower than the average due to the uptake of plants in their growing cycle. The fall and winter seasons experience a major pulse of carbon dioxide from decaying leaves and plants. Superimposed on these pulses are changes such as those related to the rates of fossil fuel combustion and to a long list of natural seasonal phenomena.

To solve the problems of analyzing carbon dioxide effects, the natural CO₂ levels and trends in changes of those levels must first be established. It is necessary to obtain estimates of historic levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, and to determine increases relative to some base. According to the report by Woodwell et al., "The increase in the CO₂ content of the atmosphere over the 120 years since 1800 exceeds 15 percent; it may be as much as 30 percent." And a report about the carbon cycle by R. A. Kerr, concluded that, "The ultimate aim of carbon cycle research is to predict how the concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere will vary as human-made pumps move more and more of it into the atmosphere... None of these models yet duplicates the present well enough to attempt predicting the future" (*Science*, 222, 1107-1108, 1983).

Among the many factors being considered in carbon dioxide/atmosphere studies, several points are noted. One is that deforestation will not be a problem if its rate continues. Forests will have disappeared by the first half of the 21st century. This might be considered an example of a change of critical factor, as would the start of reforestation. Other examples include saturation of carbon dioxide in the oceans and release of carbon dioxide from the earth's surface due to global warming. In each case, a contributing factor would suddenly cease to exist.

The interactions of the many factors affecting carbon dioxide levels are hard to decipher, but the reasons for attempting it are clear. Woodwell et al. state: "Recent rates of accumulation of CO₂ have been high enough to produce, if continued... approximately twice the amount thought to have been present in 1900." Very soon, therefore, global warming trends that could cause the shift of climatic zones, the displacement of agriculture, the disruption of major vegetation zones, and the rise of sea level by 5 m could occur.—PMB

OTA Congressional Fellowship

The Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) is seeking qualified candidates from academia, industry, and government for its Congressional Fellowship Program for 1984-1985. The program, similar to AGU's Congressional Fellowship Program, provides an opportunity for individuals who have demonstrated outstanding ability to gain a better understanding of science and technology issues facing Congress and the ways in which Congress establishes national policy related to these issues.

OTA will select up to six fellows for a 1-year program, to begin September 1984 on Capitol Hill. The fellowship is open to men and women of all disciplines who have demonstrated exceptional competency in the physical or biological sciences, engineering, law, economics, environmental and social sciences, or public policy. Candidates must have completed research and training at the doctoral level or have equivalent experience, as judged by the OTA selection committee. Salaries for successful candidates will range from \$25,000 to \$41,000 per year, based on the fellow's current salary and/or training and experience.

Fellowship applicants are required to submit a resume (up to two pages) that lists education, experience, areas of special interest; a one-page list of published works; three letters of reference; and a statement of principal expectations of the fellowship program and expected contributions to OTA during the program. For additional information, write to Congressional Fellowships, Personnel Office, Office of Technology Assessment, Congress of the United States, Washington, DC 20510. Applications for the fellowship should be sent to the OTA selection committee, above address no later than February 3, 1984. Letters of recommendation should be sent directly to OTA.—BTR

In Congress

USGS Budget Set

In fiscal 1984, the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) is budgeted for a 2.3% increase in funding over fiscal 1983. Although the fiscal year began on October 1, the Department of Interior appropriations bill, which includes the USGS budget, was not signed into law until nearly a month later. Here is a summary of the program-level funding for the USGS. The program level represents the actual money—including money from the federal treasury, residual funds, transfers, etc.—available.

Table 1 compares USGS funding for fiscal 1983, the Reagan request for fiscal 1984, and the final fiscal 1984 program levels based on the conference completed on September 29 between the House and Senate appropriations committees. The USGS is budgeted for

\$409.9 million in fiscal 1984, including \$24 million in residual funds for the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska (NPR).

Some differences between 1983 and 1984 funding for the activities and subactivities reflect changes in categorization of priorities. Nevertheless, the fiscal 1984 budget initiates some internal reforecasting of priorities. For example, there is an 11% increase in fiscal 1984 for both the water resources investigations activity (with the federal program of the national water data system getting a 23% boost) and for the National Mapping Program. The offshore geologic surveys subactivity will receive a 20% increase and the mineral resource surveys subactivity has gotten better than a 9% boost. Designated for decreases are the subactivities for energy hydrology (down 21%) and energy geologic surveys (down 12%).

The USGS budget is part of the Department of Interior appropriations bill (H.R. 3363), which was signed into law by President Reagan on November 3.—BTR

TABLE 1. USGS Fiscal 1984 Budget Status, Program Levels, in Millions of Dollars

Activity	FY 1983	Reagan FY 1984 Proposal ¹	Final Conference FY 1984 ²
Geologic and Mineral Resource Surveys			
Geological hazards	51.6	40.7	51.1
Land resource surveys	16.8	16.7	17.2
Mineral resource surveys	41.1	45.3	41.9
Energy geologic surveys	34.2	25.5	30.1
Offshore geologic surveys	13.5	13.7	18.6
Subtotal	159.2	142.9	162.2
Water Resources Investigations			
National water data system:			
federal program	54.2	55.4	66.6
National water data system:			
federal-state cooperative program	17.8	47.1	39.1
Energy hydrology	15.1	9.6	11.9
Subtotal	115.1	112.1	127.6
National Mapping Program	81.1	77.9	90.1
Facilities	9.0	13.2	10.4
General Administration	14.9	14.2	15.5
Total, USGS	399.9³	385.5⁴	405.9⁵

Source: USGS. Numbers may not total because of rounding.

¹See *Eos*, February 13, 1983, p. 105.

²Signed into law (P.L. 98-116) on November 1. Based on a conference completed September 29 between the House and Senate appropriations committees. See *Eos*, September 13, 1983, p. 518.

³Includes \$11.1 million for earth science applications, which was a separate activity in fiscal 1983. It now falls into the surveys and investigations activities. Total also includes \$5.4 million for the Barrow area gas program.

⁴Does not include money for National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska (NPR). Total also includes \$6 million for digital cartography, which had previously been included with National Mapping Program.

⁵Includes \$24 million from residual funds for NPR.

WaterWatch

WaterWatch
Area of the hydrology section.

Editors Mary P. Anderson, Department of Geology and Geophysics, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI 53706 (608-262-2395).

Welcome to WaterWatch

The President's Views on Accreditation of Hydrologists

With this issue we inaugurate WaterWatch, which is intended to bring news of water and of AGU's Hydrology Section to all readers of *Eos* at least every 3 months. One member of each of the Hydrology Section's technical committees is serving as a liaison reporter, feeding information to Mary Anderson, editor of *Eos* on hydrology, but that is not enough. Quarterly publication of a substantial feature will require the active participation of many more. I appeal to all members of the Hydrology Section to provide Mary Anderson with newsworthy items.

As Section President I plan to use WaterWatch as my primary means of communicating with the membership. Let me begin now with a brief statement on an issue of considerable interest to many of us, the accreditation of professional hydrologists and professional hydrogeologists.

As most of you know there is an active movement to create a mechanism for accreditation of hydrogeologists. The motivation for this movement appears to be twofold: (1) protection of the public from unqualified practitioners; and (2) certification of the qualifications to practice of those whose hydrologic training does not match the requirements for registration as a Professional Engineer or as a Professional Geologist. Both motivations are laudable, but both stem from the needs

of professional practice while the American Geophysical Union is a research organization. For this reason the Section Executive Committee decided (*Eos*, September 13, 1983, p. 554; December 27, 1983, p. 1095) not to involve the AGU in this certification movement, feeling that this is more properly a role for an organization such as the American Society of Civil Engineers. At the same time we urge each member to decide individually whether or not to participate.

While this decision may seem arbitrary to many, particularly to those members whose interests lie primarily in the application rather than the creation of hydrologic knowledge, it is consistent with the efforts of the last several years on the part of the AGU Hydrology Section leadership to improve the image and status of hydrology among our colleagues from the other sections of the Union. Many of the important geophysical problems of tomorrow will require active cooperation of earth scientists from many sections of AGU. I think immediately of the question of climate variability and to handle these problems together will require a firm basis of mutual scientific respect. Building this respect for hydrology, through the AGU journal *Water Resources Research*, through the nature and quality of our technical sessions, and through gaining Union recognition for our most distinguished members, continues to be my primary goal, as your President.

While this decision may seem arbitrary to many, particularly to those members whose interests lie primarily in the application rather than the creation of hydrologic knowledge, it is consistent with the efforts of the last several years on the part of the AGU Hydrology Section leadership to improve the image and status of hydrology among our colleagues from the other sections of the Union. Many of the important geophysical problems of tomorrow will require active cooperation of

(Cont. on p. 10)

Transactions, American Geophysical Union
No. 1, January 3, 1984

EOS

56831

DATE 0 MAR 1986
ACC. NO. 56831
LIBRARY
THE UNIVERSITY OF JOHNS HOPKINS

Eos, Transactions, American Geophysical Union

Vol. 65, No. 1, Pages 1-8

January 3, 1984

AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION ANNOUNCES WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

WILL BE FLOWING MORE FREQUENTLY

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

BEGINNING IN 1984

WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

will keep you even more up-to-date with its original contributions on the physical, chemical, biological, and social aspects of water science, as well as water law.

Now—More science for your subscription.

Approximately 2000 pages will be published in Volume 20, 1984. That is 15% more pages than 1983!

Water Resources Research editors are: Stephen Burges, University of Washington and Ronald Cummings, University of New Mexico

TO KEEP CURRENT WITH THE FLOW OF WATER SCIENCE INFORMATION

Call 800 424-2488
(703) 462-6993 (local DC area or outside contiguous USA)
Write: American Geophysical Union
2000 Rhode Avenue, Washington, DC 20009
AGU member \$47 • STUDENT member \$23 (outside USA add \$6 postage)

ORDER NOW

MOVING?

Give AGU your new address!

Please allow up to 6 weeks for change to be reflected in mailing. Only one notice needed for AGU membership record and all AGU subscriptions. Return this form, with label, to:

American Geophysical Union
2000 Rhode Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20009

Please print or type new address

New phone numbers (will be published in Membership Directory)

Office ()
Home ()

For faster action,
Call toll free 800-424-2488;
or call (202) 462-6993.
Write Western Union Telex 710-822-9300.



